Survey of Homeless in Canada

Phase II, Part 2:
Street Component Pilot Test Investigation

April 2001

Statistics Canada Statistique Canada

Background

Statistics Canada (STC) has been contracted by Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) to undertake a feasibility study on conducting a survey of homelessness in Canada. The primary objective of a national survey of the homeless population would be to obtain a count of the number of 'absolute' homeless[1] while a secondary objective would be to collect socio-economic information to better understand the issues related to homelessness.

In Phase I of this feasibility study, a literature review of the methodology used in previous homeless studies[2] was undertaken and used to help establish a set of preliminary sample design options that were to be investigated more closely. This investigation led to the recommendation of a multi-frame approach[3] based on the fact that the homeless population can be divided into two components on any given night - the shelter population and the street population.

The focus of Phase II of this feasibility study is the *street component*. The street component is considered to be the more difficult of the two populations to reach and most expensive to survey because homeless street people are difficult to locate, identify and uniquely count during any survey reference period. This phase of study has also been broken up into multiple parts. In the first part, a report was prepared comparing the advantages and disadvantages of various multi-frame approaches that might be used to survey the street component of the homeless population. This report included recommendations on the methodology to be used to survey the street component as well as other considerations to be taken into account for a national survey[4].

The project is now in the second part of Phase II. This part involves the preparation of a detailed plan in order to investigate the operational feasibility of conducting a pilot survey of the street component population: classification and selection of potential pilot sites; identification of possible objectives of a pilot study; and the possible roles of Statistics Canada in such a study. The tasks and activities associated with this second part are detailed in the next section.

---

[1] The population of interest for the survey is those who are absolutely homeless according to the 1987 United Nations definition - i.e., individuals or families who either have no housing at all or are staying in temporary forms of shelter - within certain specified Canadian areas. The component of the homeless population staying temporarily in private residences of friends or acquaintances will not be covered by this survey.

[2] Mantel, H. and Yung, W., *First Steps towards a Survey of Homelessness in Canada – Lessons from Previous Studies,* Statistics Canada, April 2000

[3] Mantel, H. and Yung, W., *Sample Design Options for a Survey of Homeless in Canada*, Statistics Canada, August 2000

[4] Laflamme, F., *Survey of Homeless in Canada: Street component - Feasibility Study,* Statistical Consultation Group, Statistics Canada, April 2001

Objectives

The main objective of this document is to investigate the operational feasibility of conducting a pilot survey for the street component of the homeless population. This report would first, aid HRDC in their decision as to whether to proceed with a pilot test survey and second, if the decision to proceed is made, aid in the identification of the potential objectives of such a pilot and in the identification of one or more pilot sites. Under the current MOU with HRDC, STC agreed to investigate the following tasks, activities and issues related to a potential street component pilot survey.

A) Categorize the areas identified to HRDC with respect to their homeless street population
B) Organize a workshop of homelessness regional and national experts
C) Define potential objectives of a pilot test
D) Identify criteria for determining the urban area(s) in which a pilot could be conducted
E) Investigate thoroughly the selected urban areas. Identify 2 to 4 urban areas in which a pilot could be conducted
F) Produce a cost estimate for those urban areas selected for a pilot.
G) Determine the role Statistics Canada can play in such a study

Current Status

Because of new research recently published on the homeless street population, and informal consultations with homeless experts, it was decided to shorten the current project phase and postpone some activities initially planned for Part 2 to a later date.

A. Categorization of the 61 urban areas

Upon reviewing the 61 urban areas initially identified to HDRC as part of an overall comprehensive Survey of Homelessness in Canada, the first question which comes to mind is, do all these areas have a (significant) street component? Even though, many Canadian areas have a "countable" homeless population, few of them have a "significant" street component that will be worthwhile to survey given the costs to target this population. Thus it is believed that one of the initial tasks would be to attempt to group these areas into groups with respect to their expected street component population. In particular, the 61 areas initially identified to HRDC were categorized into the following three groups with respect to their *street component* population:

1) Areas expected to have a street component;
2) Areas with a potential street component;
3) Areas not expected to have a (significant) street component.

In order to categorize the areas, the following sources of information were used:

- External sources of information from previous community studies
- Information available on Homelessness from Census and HIFIS
- Population characteristics (Census, Small Area Data)
- Economic indicators (Small Area Data, Labor Force Survey)
- Consultation with homeless experts

Table 1 provides the result of this preliminary classification. The first group corresponds roughly to large Canadian metropolitan areas where there is ample evidence of the presence of a significant street population. The second group 'with a potential street component' is essentially referring to some large and medium size urban areas (or smaller urban areas with a large proportion of low-income families). Finally, the last group for which there is no available evidence of a (significant) street component population roughly corresponds to smaller urban areas.

Table 1: Preliminary Classification of the 61 Areas Identified To HRDC With Respect to Their Homeless Street Population

Areas with a street component**		Areas with a "potential" street component***		Areas with no expected street component****			
Area	Prov	Area	Prov	Area	Prov	Area	Prov
Montreal	PQ	St.John's	NF	Kamloops	BC	Guelph	ON
Toronto	ON	Halifax	NS	Kelowna	BC	Halton	ON
Calgary	AB	Sydney	NS	Nanaimo	BC	Kingston	ON
Vancouver	BC	Saint John	NB	Nelson	BC	North Bay	ON
		Quebec City	PQ	Prince George	BC	Peel Region	ON
		Sherbrooke	PQ	Whitehorse	YK	Peterborough	ON
		Hamilton	ON	Yellowknife	NWT	Region of Durham	ON
		Kitchener	ON	Iqaluit	INV	Sault St.Marie	ON
		London	ON	Grand Prairie	AB	Sudbury	ON
		Ottawa	ON	Lethbridge	AB	York Region	ON
		St.Catherines-Niagara	ON	Medicine Hat	AB	Chicoutimi	PQ
		Thunder Bay	ON	Red Deer	AB	Drummondville	PQ
		Windsor	ON	Wood Buffalo	AB	Hull	PQ
		Winnipeg	MB	Prince Albert	SK	Trois -Rivières	PQ
		Regina	SK	Brandon	MB	Bathurst	NB
		Saskatoon	SK	Thompson	MB	Moncton	NB
		Edmonton	AB	Barrie	ON	Fredericton	NB
		Victoria	BC	Belleville	ON	Charlottetown	PEI
				Brantford	ON	Summerside	PEI
				Dufferin	ON		

Notes: * This classification should be updated when new information becomes available.

** Large Urban population, with some evidence for the presence of a street population

*** Medium size areas (> 100,000) and smaller urban areas with large proportion of low income families

**** Medium and smaller urban areas with no indication of a significant presence of a street population

It should be kept in mind that this classification was performed under the assumption of mounting a national Homeless Survey (both shelter and street) with limited resources and with convergent information that the street component accounts for a small proportion of the overall homeless population (<10% and most likely <5% with longer reference periods). Notwithstanding this, some of the areas that were classified in group 2, could be included from a provincial/regional perspective for a more thorough approach. Areas in group 3 should not be considered in-scope for any street component survey. Finally, this classification should be updated when new information becomes available[5].

B. Workshop of Homelessness Experts

As part of these preliminary field test investigations, a round table of homelessness experts was planned by STC/HRDC in order to investigate the operational feasibility, benefits and drawbacks of conducting a pilot survey as well as to help in the categorization of the 61 Canadian areas identified by HRDC. In light of research recently published, consultations and recommendations

[5] The detailed table used for this classification is presented in Appendix I.

by experts in this area, the STC project team is convinced that the original workshop objectives are probably not substantive enough[6].

Nevertheless, even though no formal workshop was organized, many consultations, did take place with recognized homeless experts including those directly involved in street component studies in their communities. These discussions were very useful and productive and many of the key issues raised in those discussions are reported on in this report.

C. Potential Objectives of a Pilot Test

Most research on enumerating the "street component"[7] by experts on this issue concludes that the "street component" makes up less than 10% (on a daily basis) of the homeless population and most likely less than 2% when a yearly prevalence measure is used[8]. One objective of conducting a pilot test could be, in essence, to prove that the "street component" is small, and not very significant in relation to the shelter population. Survey results from Montreal, Calgary, and Vancouver support this conclusion – the number of homeless people reported on the street on a given night were respectively 186, 168 and 300. Studies also show that the street component can be covered in surveying the 'shelter' and 'services' for a longer period (prevalence approach) allowing more chance to capture occasional shelter/service users. For example, of the 186 individuals found on the street in the Montreal study 90% were determined to have used either shelter or services during a one-year reference period.

Given that there is a convergence of expert advice and actual results of street component surveys that the street component population generally composes 10% or less of the overall homeless population it is not recommended that an enumeration be the sole objective of a pilot test. Other survey objectives could be pursued by HRDC and perhaps would then justify the cost of such an exercise. For example, these are some of the objectives that could be pursed by HRDC in this pilot:

- Determine if other methodologies could be adopted to estimate the "pure street component" more efficiently and with less cost (use of a "service" frame for example);
- Determine how effective standard methodologies are in estimating "pure-street" populations- i.e., perform a coverage check using a "service" frame survey on the following day;
- Determine the ratio of "pure street homeless" to the total homeless count ("pure street" plus " shelter")
- Assess as far as possible whether the survey methodologies used are robust and generalizeable to undertake pure street counts in an urban area of any size.
- Determine if it is possible to collect more extensive information and under what conditions.

D. Identify Criteria to Select Urban Area(s)

Since street component surveys have already relatively recently been conducted in Montreal, Vancouver, Calgary and Edmonton and given that a proposed Toronto survey collapsed, there remain very few areas where it is likely that sufficient numbers of *street* homeless will be found to achieve the test objectives and efficiently test the proposed methodology. Choosing an area in which there was a recent count risks the danger of not obtaining the renewed support from the

[6] If a workshop does go ahead, it will have vastly different objectives than initially envisioned.
[7] The references are presented in Appendix II.
[8] As opposed to a snapshot of the homeless population (daily measure), the prevalence approach tends to enumerate the number of unique individuals that are consistently in the street component population during the reference period, generally, a year.

professional community in such a brief period of elapsed time. Nevertheless, following are some criteria that could be used to make such a selection: population size with preference for mid-size city over larger centre, regional location, at least anecdotal evidence of a *street* homeless population of at least 50 individuals on any given night, a small centralized core as compared with urban area that has a more sprawling central core, cost estimate, and anticipated community support.

E. Investigate Selected Areas and Identify 2 to 4 Areas for Potential Pilot

Since the list of potential areas that have not already been covered recently by a street component survey is relatively short, Ottawa and possibly Victoria are more likely to be the only two Canadian areas where it will be possible and worthwhile to conduct a pilot test. However, further investigation will be required to determine to which extent they are good candidates and is contingent on a decision to proceed with a pilot.

F. Factors Affecting Street Component Cost Estimates

Costs to conduct 'street' component surveys are relatively expensive in relation to the number of enumerated respondents. The reason for this is that interviewer security must be ensured, interviewing is conducted at irregular times with premium rates paid to interviewers, and the number of interviewing teams must be sufficient to completely enumerate the entire urban area in the reference period thereby increasing the number of interviewers and the training costs that would otherwise be needed if a longer interviewing period were available. The number of interviewing teams needed is also dictated by the necessary number of geographic divisions of the area to be surveyed. An area with a sprawling core will cost more to survey than one that has a relatively concentrated core. Some earlier *street* component surveys have obtained the help of volunteers to cut down on the costs of conducting an enumeration. These volunteers are recruited from the social agencies servicing the homeless (e.g., coordinating and administrative agencies, shelter and service providers). Using these people as interviewers has the additional benefit that they are familiar with the local issues affecting homelessness in their community.

Aside from interviewing costs, these surveys incur substantial communications and consultation costs. Some of the necessary tasks involve identifying, contacting and listing all shelter and other service providers to the homeless in each selected urban area; notifying municipal officials - politicians, municipal officials, police, shelter and service providers, etc.; notifying local media; and notifying the homeless.

G. Statistics Canada Involvement

Senior STC management was consulted in order to determine what role STC could play in both a pilot and national street component survey of homelessness given the substantial differences of such an undertaking from typical household based surveys. Following were some of the major factors affecting future STC involvement:

Operationally very difficult - The street component is very difficult to operationalize because homeless people are difficult to locate, identify and uniquely count during any survey reference period. Previous surveys have involved dividing an urban area into mutually exclusive sections and with multiple teams of interviewers conducting a one-night census, generally, in the depths of the night (between 1:00 and 6:00A.M.) when there is minimal movement of this population. This involves covering all areas where the homeless can be expected to be found – parks, under bridges, in abandoned and condemned buildings, etc. Most of the information relating to popular places where the homeless sleep 'in the rough' must be obtained from local officials (shelter and

service providers, police and fire department officials, and other government officials) and the homeless themselves.

STC capacity to collect "street" component data - STC would have great difficulty adhering to policy guidelines and in ensuring interviewer security under the necessary data collection conditions.

- Interviewer security: Ensuring interviewer security during data collection in physically challenging areas to reach and under potentially dangerous conditions is a major issue. Complete enumeration would require interviewers to enter insecure areas or private property (e.g., abandoned or condemned buildings) raising issues both of safety and trespass.
- STC policy guidelines: STC has a policy on informing survey respondents that entails informing respondents: about the purpose of the survey; the voluntary/mandatory nature of participation; and any confidentiality issues. This could be extremely difficult if data collection is attempted under difficult conditions, e.g., when the individual is found incoherent or sleeping, or is aggressive to approaching strangers.
- STC contracting out the data collection - Contracting out the data collection will not necessarily relieve STC from ultimate responsibility for interviewer safety, considerations of trespass, or its responsibilities under privacy and other legislation if Statistics Canada is the contracting authority.
- Use of incentives - The information collected in past surveys has varied from counts with some observation to the use of extensive questionnaires. When extensive questionnaires are used incentives to participate are usually offered (food coupons, cigarettes etc…) to increase participation. This is a route STC has traditionally resisted in the past.

Community participation and involvement - No attempt at counting the homeless will be successful without the cooperation of the professionals servicing the homeless. One consistent theme from discussions with homelessness experts is that in the ideal situation the community itself would have responsibility for conducting homeless counts because they know their community 'best'.

Costing - Keeping STC involved in data collection raises costs from that which would be possible by contracting out the project to an external organization such as university social work department or to a community based approach where volunteers are typically used as interviewers.

Conclusion

Given the results of recently published reports on street component surveys and consultations with homeless experts, the project team recommends to HRDC that they do not proceed with a pilot study of the street component with the sole objective of obtaining a count. There are other objectives that could persuade HRDC in their decision to proceed with a pilot that the project team could support. If HRDC did decide to proceed with a pilot then the department must understand that this is a high-risk venture and success is not assured as it is so dependent on community support being initially obtained and maintained. Additionally, all interested must be made to understand that the street count is for that area for that point in time. The estimate will be different for other points in time.

Even if HRDC decided to pursue one or more of these objectives, STC could not be involved in any data collection effort, principally, because of the continued liability of STC even if data collection were contracted out to a third party. Nonetheless, it would be possible for STC to be involved in the development of the methodology and documentation[9] that could be used and implemented by participant communities to harmonize the methods, definitions, and concepts used in order to improve comparability and to produce a more reliable national count.

HRDC now needs decide whether to proceed with a pilot test. If the answer is yes, then HRDC needs determine the objectives of this pilot test, in how many and which areas they wish to conduct it, and who will conduct and manage it. In addition, HRDC and STC will need to determine their continuing roles in a comprehensive national homelessness survey.

[9] General methodology and documentation for the Street component Survey of Homeless are briefly described in Appendix III.

Appendix II: Street Component Studies References

Calgary

The City of Calgary has completed the fifth in a series of biennial surveys of various downtown shelter and non-shelter service providers on a designated night to determine both the numbers of homeless persons who were served by such services and observed sleeping on the street. Data is now available for the years 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000.

Source: http://www.gov.calgary.ab.ca//community/publications/hcensus2000/index.html
Contact: John teLinde, jtelinde@gov.calgary.ab.ca

Montreal

As a part of the 1996-97 Homeless Study, a street component pilot study was conducted in Montreal that estimated about 180 individuals sleep on the street on a given night.

Source: Dénombrement de la clientèle des ressources pour personnes itinérantes dans les villes de Montréal et de Québec 1996-97
Contact: Louise Fournier - Direction de la santé publique de Montréal-centre

Edmonton

Information on Homeless in Edmonton is based on a report entitled *Homeless in Edmonton, a call to Action*(May 99). This report includes a snapshot of the homeless population that took place in March 1999.

Source: Homeless in Edmonton, a call to Action(May 99).

Vancouver

The City of Vancouver conducted a street count survey from the fall of 1998 to the spring of 2001 using a 'Walkabout' method. The study estimated that about 300 individuals sleep outside on any given night in the city of Vancouver.

Source: Administrative Report – Direction of the housing Centre
Contact: Judy Graves - judy_graves@city.vancouver.bc.ca

USA Study

The Washington, DC Metropolitan Area Drug Study (DC*MADS) and the Chicago Homeless Study, two major surveys on homelessness, both had a pure street component. They found that this component was extremely expensive to survey and did not add much to overall estimates. There was also some evidence that most of the homeless population may be covered by shelter or service frames (over 90% in the DC*MADS study, though great variation was observed from one area to another).

Appendix III: General methodology for the Street component Survey of Homeless for Canadian communities

The main objective of the street component survey of absolute homelessness would be to obtain a count of homeless individuals that live on the street on a given night in using comparable methodology across the country and to identify those who systematically live in shelters during the reference period. This distinction is necessary if one wants to combine shelter counts determined by the prevalence approach[10] with street counts and avoid duplicate counting of individuals[11] who do both from time to time. A secondary objective of such a survey could be to collect more detailed information about homeless individuals.

For the first objective, an area and/or site frame could be used to survey the street component of the homeless population on the reference night. More specifically, a census of homeless individuals would be made in the area/site on the reference night to determine the size of the homeless population for the community. It is recommended only a minimum number of questions should be asked respondents to establish their "homeless" status and to collect some basic demographic information such as age. In particular, questions about where they are going to sleep during the night and for how many consecutive nights they have spent on the street (if they are going to sleep on the street on the night of the survey) are among the most important questions to establish a count.

The areas to survey could be determined using community maps while the creation of the site lists would need be established by speaking with "knowledgeable individuals", in each community. For example, Census Enumeration Area (EA's) maps could be used to completely divide the urban area into mutually exclusive an exhaustive areas (including any identified potential sites) and to ensure that the workload is most efficiently divided amongst the interviewers. On the other hand, the site list could use social workers, service providers, policemen and fireman (for example, list of abandoned building, no trespass areas for safety reasons etc…) expertise.

In order to collect more detailed information about homeless individuals, a sample could be drawn employing a two-stage probability sample design. In the first stage, a sample of service locations (i.e., drop-in centers, soup kitchens, etc.) could be selected with probability proportional to size, i.e., the total number of clients served. In the second stage, a sample of individuals could be sampled using pre-defined selection procedures. During the second phase, in-depth interviews would be conducted with screened and selected street homeless individuals (that use services) to collect more individual/socio-economic information. As the "pure-street" population is, by definition not reachable through services, no in-depth information would be possible unless it is decided to collect such information on the street during the enumeration or to make "appointments" with individuals for later interviews.

The previous discussion provides general guidelines to conduct a street component survey of the homeless as well as indicating how the shelter and street counts could be combined to produce an overall count given the approach retained for the shelter component. However, more detailed

[10] As opposed to a snapshot of the homeless population, the prevalence approach tends to enumerate the number of unique individuals that are consistently in the street component population during the reference period, generally, a year.

[11] If a snapshot approach is adopted for both shelter and street components, duration of homelessness is not required and the homeless count is simply the sum of the shelter and street components.

survey procedures (including interviewer/observer instructions) would have to be specified before all communities could conduct comparable surveys that use common methodology and similar concepts and definitions of homelessness. In this regard, consultation with communities who have already conducted homelessness studies would be essential to take advantage of their experience[12].

[12] Montreal, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver have had at least one homeless study conducted.

Appendix I: Statistics for the 61 cities identified by HRDC

		Census - 1996				Small Area data -1998							LFS -2000**		Shelters						
						All families		Low income families*		Social Ben. families	Percent of low income families	Percent of social benefits families			Census Dwel. 1996 list		HIFIS last update		Daily Average		
		Population City	Population CMA	Avg ind. income	Unempl. rate	Number	Median income	Number	Median income	Number			Slippage Rate***	Unemploy. Rate	Shelter code(41,42)	Other code(65)	Shelter	Beds	Shelter[z] pop cnt	Street pop cnt	info Year
Montreal	**PQ**	1,016,376	3,326,510	$20,770	15.0%	538,380	23,100	172,780	8,900	103,860	32.1%	19.3%	4.0%	7.9%	25	38	N/A	N/A	**1000**	180	96
Toronto	**ON**	653,734	4,263,757	$31,559	13.8%	1,119,220	31,900	275,130	8,700	165,910	24.6%	14.8%	12.1%	6.0%	24	28	61	2939	3136		96
Vancouver	**BC**	514,088	1,831,665	$25,913	9.8%	282,590	27,700	81,300	8,300	35,540	28.8%	12.6%	13.4%	5.9%	26	12	26	737	**950**	300	01
Calgary	**AB**	768,088	821,628	$28,626	6.7%	370,240	40,800	59,410	8,500	43,000	16.0%	11.6%	12.8%	4.4%	15	9	15	960	1128	168****	98
Edmonton	**AB**	616,306	862,597	$24,783	9.0%	289,270	34,100	58,290	9,000	53,630	20.2%	18.5%	0.0%	5.0%	12	12	10	534	836		99
Winnipeg	**MB**	618,477	667,209	$24,012	8.2%	280,440	34,000	53,810	9,100	28,370	19.2%	10.1%	2.3%	5.1%	12	13	4	N/A			
Ottawa	**ON**	323,340	1,010,408	$28,960	10.7%	328,730	42,200	61,920	9,000	46,830	18.8%	14.2%	1.1%	5.4%	10	14	9	368	400		
Hamilton	**ON**	322,352	624,360	$23,473	10.7%	146,460	32,200	31,970	10,100	27,990	21.8%	19.1%	6.4%	6.1%	17	4	13	194			
Quebec City	**PQ**	167,264	671,889	$21,653	12.8%	91,320	25,000	25,910	8,900	17,250	28.4%	18.9%	8.9%	7.9%	3	5	10	N/A	**200**		
Halifax	**NS**	113,990	332,518	$25,151	9.2%	65,130	31,300	14,870	8,900	6,750	22.8%	10.4%	7.3%	6.6%	5	5	4	124			
Kamloops	**BC**	76,396		$25,386	11.1%	35,050	36,700	7,450	9,400	4,830	21.3%	13.8%	23.0%	13.0%	3	0	5	118			
Kelowna	**BC**	89,442		$24,187	9.7%	50,940	32,800	9,730	9,700	5,250	19.1%	10.3%	13.3%	6.2%	3	6	10	129			
Nanaimo	**BC**	70,130		$24,209	12.3%	35,010	33,000	7,780	9,800	5,640	22.2%	16.1%	4.9%	12.6%	3	1	2	40	**90**		99
Nelson	**BC**	9,585		$23,188	11.4%	7,440	30,000	1,750	9,300	910	23.5%	12.2%			0	1	N/A	N/A	**10**		99
Prince George	**BC**	75,150		$28,464	11.7%	35,960	40,600	7,490	9,500	5,370	20.8%	14.9%	21.4%	10.2%	10	3	N/A	N/A	**10**		99
Victoria	**BC**	73,504	304,287	$24,302	9.6%	124,060	35,800	22,560	8,900	12,910	18.2%	10.4%	7.3%	6.3%	6	4	8	189	**200**		99
Whitehorse	**YK**	19,157		$31,458	9.5%	9,710	40,200	1,930	7,500	760	19.9%	7.8%			1	4	N/A	N/A			
Yellowknife	**NWT**	17,275		$39,086	6.4%	7,110	56,800	1,020	7,000	570	14.3%	8.0%			0	1	3	33			
Iqaluit	**INV**	4,220		$33,304	10.4%	1,740	44,700	380	8,400	270	21.8%	15.5%			1	1	2	34			
Grand Prairie	**AB**	31,140		$26,947	7.7%	17,120	44,400	2,420	8,900	1,810	14.1%	10.6%	12.5%	2.9%	0	1	3	N/A			
Lethbridge	**AB**	63,053		$23,754	6.8%	32,040	33,500	6,140	9,000	5,680	19.2%	17.7%	-5.6%	5.6%	0	3	2	132			
Medicine Hat	**AB**	46,783		$23,682	7.7%	22,730	35,000	3,380	10,000	4,290	14.9%	18.9%	2.6%	5.0%	1	0	2	41			
Red Deer	**AB**	60,075		$24,748	9.7%	30,280	37,700	5,360	9,800	4,840	17.7%	16.0%	5.5%	6.7%	5	1	3	41			
Wood Buffalo	**AB**	35,213		$36,237	8.5%										1	0	3	69			
Prince Albert	**SK**	34,777		$22,722	10.9%	17,310	29,700	4,760	10,500	3,030	27.5%	17.5%	6.3%	8.2%	1	2	3	67			
Regina	**SK**	180,400	193,652	$25,774	7.5%	79,380	37,400	14,880	9,700	10,410	18.7%	13.1%	2.0%	5.4%	5	4	3	40			
Saskatoon	**SK**	193,647	219,056	$24,284	7.8%	86,740	34,300	18,730	9,600	11,390	21.6%	13.1%	5.9%	5.7%	4	5	7	158			
Brandon	**MB**	39,175		$22,504	7.4%	20,160	31,200	4,430	9,800	1,560	22.0%	7.7%	2.6%	4.7%	1	1	3	N/A			
Thompson	**MB**	14,385		$31,257	8.0%	5,260	52,700	1,160	10,200	710	22.1%	13.5%			0	2	0	0			
Barrie	**ON**	79,191		$26,383	9.3%	41,330	40,300	7,310	9,300	4,040	17.7%	9.8%			7	1	6	61			
Belleville	**ON**	37,083		$23,465	11.9%	22,000	32,100	4,420	10,100	3,850	20.1%	17.5%			0	0	0	0			
Brantford	**ON**	84,764		$23,939	9.2%	39,450	34,900	7,150	10,800	6,050	18.1%	15.3%			5	1	3	N/A			

Appendix I: Statistics for the 61 cities identified by HRDC

		Census - 1996				Small Area data -1998							LFS -2000**		Shelters					
		Population		Avg ind. income	Unempl. rate	All families Number	All families Median income	Low income families* Number	Low income families* Median income	Social Ben. families Number	Percent of low income families	Percent of social benefits families	Slippage Rate***	Unemploy. Rate	Census Dwel. 1996 list Shelter code(41,42)	Census Dwel. 1996 list Other code(65)	HIFIS last update Shelter	HIFIS last update Beds	Daily Average Shelter[z] pop cnt	Street pop cnt	info Year
		City	CMA																	
Dufferin	**ON**					187,800	48,300	28,020	8,900	16,700	14.9%	8.9%			0	0	2	61			
Guelph	**ON**	95,821		$26,863	6.8%	45,750	43,000	6,670	8,900	4,080	14.6%	8.9%	-1.8%	4.6%	0	3	N/A	N/A			
Halton	**ON**	42,390		$30,883	5.9%	140,680	56,500	14,940	8,000	6,290	10.6%	4.5%			0	0	4	17			
Kingston	**ON**	55,947		$23,379	13.1%	50,780	34,600	10,750	9,500	8,650	21.2%	17.0%	8.3%	6.5%	2	16	6	68			
Kitchener	**ON**	178,420	382,940	$25,398	8.7%	78,890	38,700	13,190	9,800	11,420	16.7%	14.5%	14.5%	6.0%	1	6	10	238			
London	**ON**	325,646	398,616	$26,685	9.6%	147,290	36,500	28,820	9,500	21,880	19.6%	14.9%	4.7%	6.2%	7	5	N/A	N/A			
North Bay	**ON**	54,332		$24,673	10.8%	24,610	31,600	5,550	10,200	4,680	22.6%	19.0%	1.9%	7.8%	3	1	5	116			
Peel Region	**ON**					360,320	44,500	65,200	8,500	26,690	18.1%	7.4%					5	177			
Peterborough	**ON**	69,535		$24,126	11.8%	37,570	33,000	7,370	9,900	5,940	19.6%	15.8%	14.4%	5.7%	0	1	4	N/A			
Region of Durham	**ON**																6	173			
Sault	**ON**	80,054		$24,582	12.8%	36,300	35,200	7,290	10,400	7,000	20.1%	19.3%	15.3%	7.5%	2	3	N/A	N/A			
St.Catherines-Niagara	**ON**	130,926	372,406	$24,935	10.1%	59,060	35,600	10,190	10,400	8,420	17.3%	14.3%	6.8%	6.5%	2	1	3	N/A			
Sudbury	**ON**	92,059	160,488	$25,657	12.4%	40,760	31,700	9,580	9,600	8,440	23.5%	20.7%	4.0%	8.6%	2	1	4	68			
Thunder Bay	**ON**	113,662	125,562	$26,243	10.6%	53,980	37,200	10,180	9,300	7,200	18.9%	13.3%	6.2%	7.6%	3	7	5	N/A			
Windsor	**ON**	197,694	278,685	$26,016	9.0%	110,280	40,900	19,590	9,500	14,430	17.8%	13.1%	11.0%	6.4%	3	2	4	145			
York Region	**ON**					244,910	49,700	42,180	8,100	13,350	17.2%	5.5%			12	1	5	98			
Chicoutimi	**PQ**	63,061	160,454	$23,177	12.7%	29,370	32,100	6,540	9,100	4,400	22.3%	15.0%	9.8%	10.6%	0	2	N/A				
Drummondville	**PQ**	44,882		$20,529	10.5%	25,980	27,500	5,880	9,600	3,820	22.6%	14.7%			0	0	2	N/A			
Hull	**PQ**	62,339	see ottawa	$25,177	10.4%	31,140	30,500	7,310	9,100	5,080	23.5%	16.3%	9.1%	7.0%	0	6	N/A	N/A			
Sherbrooke	**PQ**	76,786	147,384	$20,931	12.2%	41,110	23,800	11,800	8,900	7,500	28.7%	18.2%	7.4%	7.5%	3	12	6	N/A			
Trois -Rivières	**PQ**	49,426	139,956	$20,780	14.1%	25,180	23,600	7,540	8,900	5,220	29.9%	20.7%	6.7%	9.4%	0	6	2	N/A			
Saint John	**NB**	72,494	125,705	$20,772	14.3%	33,950	26,600	9,260	10,200	5,920	27.3%	17.4%	4.9%	9.0%	2	3	3	62			
Bathurst	**NB**	13,815		$20,664	14.5%	6,310	26,400	1,810	10,800	1,080	28.7%	17.1%	11.6%	13.8%	0	0	0	0			
Moncton	**NB**	59,313		$22,671	10.1%	28,320	30,000	6,610	10,000	3,320	23.3%	11.7%	10.7%	7.3%	3	0	5	85			
Fredericton	**NB**	46,507		$25,138	9.6%	22,040	33,100	4,760	8,900	1,890	21.6%	8.6%	11.8%	8.0%	3	3	2	42			
Charlottetown	**PEI**	32,531		$22,000	12.9%	18,040	28,800	4,270	10,000	2,180	23.7%	12.1%	12.6%	8.5%	0	1	2	28			
Summersid	**PEI**	14,525		$21,099	10.5%	6,960	29,600	1,530	11,000	680	22.0%	9.8%	0.5%	9.2%	0	0	0	0			
Sydney	**NS**	114,733		$18,428	22.5%	18,950	26,900	5,360	10,000	3,380	28.3%	17.8%	9.0%	19.9%	5	1	2	16			
St.John's	**NF**	101,936	174,051	$23,409	14.0%	41,190	29,200	11,600	9,500	6,160	28.2%	15.0%	4.7%	9.0%	8	8	5	106			

Notes: * Low income considers family income, family composition and family size. For more information see saadinfo@statcan.ca

** Average unemployment rate from Aug-2000 to Sept-2001

*** Slippage is expressed as a percent, where final weights are weights calibrated to census projections and subweights are the adjusted surv

High slippage in an given area means that census count/projection are higher then LFS survey estimates. For example, if slippage is very

It may mean that the LFS survey has possibly missed many individuals who homeless individuals. - LFS is a dwelling

**** Calgary conducted studies in 92,94,96, 98, 2000. The street counts were respectively 5, 7, 15,

***** Some shelter counts (shaded presentations) were derived from prprevalence estimates